




confrontation, self-incrimination and burden of proof.” Advisory Committee Note, 1976 Adoption (emphasis in original.)

The appointment of counsel in a § 2255 proceeding is a matter solely within the discretion of the court. United States v. Degand, 614 F.2d 176 (8th Cir. 1980); Tweedy v. United States, 435 F.2d 702, 703-04 (8th Cir. 1970) (citing Fleming v. United States, 367 F.2d 555 (5th Cir. 1966)). Normally these collateral attacks do not warrant the appointment of counsel. Tweedy, 435 F.2d at 703-04.

The Court has reviewed the claims raised by Movant in his § 2255 Motion and Supplement thereto and has reviewed the underlying criminal case. The Court finds that the facts and legal issues presented in the instant case are not so complex as to warrant the appointment of counsel at this time. In addition, the pleadings filed by Movant indicate he is capable of presenting the facts and legal issues without the assistance of counsel. His motion for appointment of counsel will therefore be denied.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Robert Austin Jackson, Jr.’s letter to the Court, construed as a Motion for Appointment of Counsel, is **DENIED**. (ECF No. 11)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**RONNIE L. WHITE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Dated this 29th day of June, 2022.